

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Tehama)

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RAMONA DEANN CAMPBELL,

Defendant and Appellant.

C090485

(Super. Ct. No. 19CR001418)

Appointed counsel for defendant Ramona Deann Campbell has filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and asking this court to review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal that would result in a judgment more favorable to defendant. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) After reviewing the entire record, we affirm the judgment.

## FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

There are two victims in this case; the first (the son) was six or seven years old when he began living with defendant, his foster mother. When he was eight years old, defendant adopted him. When he was 13 years old, defendant started having sex with him. Defendant engaged in hundreds of sexual acts with the son in the subsequent six years.

Defendant began having sex with the second victim, who was the son's friend, between his sophomore and junior years of high school. Over a two-year period, defendant had sex with the friend about 10 times. Her final sexual encounter with the friend occurred in December 2018.

In July 2019 defendant pleaded guilty to: oral copulation of the son when he was under the age of 18 (Pen. Code, § 287, subd. (b)(1) -- count I);<sup>1</sup> two counts of sexual intercourse with the son, a minor more than three years younger than defendant (§ 261.5, subd. (c) -- counts II and III); sexual intercourse with the son when he was under 16 and defendant was over 21 (§ 261.5, subd. (d) -- count IV); two counts of sexual intercourse with the friend, a minor more than three years younger than defendant (§ 261.5, subd. (c) -- counts VI and VII); and sexual intercourse with the friend, when he was under 16 and defendant was over 21 (§ 261.5, subd. (d) -- count VIII). In exchange for her open plea, two misdemeanor counts against defendant were dismissed.

The plea form that defendant signed indicated that the aggregate maximum prison time she faced was eight years four months, and the trial court confirmed defendant understood that.

In September 2019 the trial court sentenced defendant to eight years four months in prison, consisting of: a principal term of four years on count IV (the upper term); five

---

<sup>1</sup> Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

consecutive terms of eight months for counts I, II, III, VI, and VII (one-third the middle term); and a consecutive term of one year for count VIII (one-third the middle term).

The trial court calculated 224 days of credit, and informed defendant that she would have to “register pursuant to . . . section 290.” The court ordered defendant to pay “fines and fees . . . exactly as set forth in the probation report,” and then confirmed defense counsel’s “waive[r] [of] the breakdown of the fines and fees on the [a]bstract” of judgment.

The abstract of judgment reflects the assessments and fines as recommended in the probation report: \$280 in assessments pursuant to section 1465.8; \$210 in assessments pursuant to Government Code section 70373; a \$600 fine pursuant to section 1202.4, subdivision (b); a stayed \$600 fine pursuant to section 1202.45; and a sex offender fine (base fine of \$300 pursuant to § 290.3, plus penalty assessments) amounting to \$1,080.

#### DISCUSSION

Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts and procedural history of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of his right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days from the date the opening brief was filed. More than 30 days have elapsed, and defendant has not filed a supplemental brief. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record pursuant to *Wende*, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

/s/  
Duarte, J.

We concur:

/s/  
Hull, Acting P. J.

/s/  
Krause, J.